

**REMARKS**

The Office Action dated December 19, 2007, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

In this Response, claims 1-5 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the present invention. Claims 6-10 were previously withdrawn in Applicant's Response filed on November 16, 2007, in response to the Restriction Requirement dated October 31, 2007. Accordingly, claims 1-5 are currently pending in the application, of which claim 1 is the only independent claim. Applicant requests entry of the above amendments because the above amendments place the claims in better condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending rejections to the claims for the reasons discussed below.

***Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)***

The Office Action rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable as obvious over Miyashita, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,558,015) ("Miyashita") in view of Coluzzi (U.S. Patent No. 5,051,083) ("Coluzzi"). Applicant respectfully submits that the claims recite subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the combination of Miyashita and Coluzzi.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-5 depend, recites a press-molding apparatus. The press-molding apparatus includes a first mold, and a second mold disposed to face the first mold. The second mold is configured to advance and retreat. The second mold includes a substrate, a heat insulating member disposed on a side of the substrate which side faces the first mold, and a machining member disposed on a side of the heat insulating member which side faces the first mold and including irregularities on a surface facing the first mold. The press-molding apparatus further includes a loading processing section configured to load a to-be-machined member on the first mold, a heating processing section configured to heat the to-be-machined member to a molding temperature higher than a state change point of a material which constitutes the to-be-machined member, and a transfer processing section configured to press the machining member against the to-be-machined member so as to transfer the irregularities to the to-be-machined member.

As will be discussed below, the combination of Miyashita and Coluzzi would fail to disclose or suggest every feature recited in claims 1-5, and therefore would fail to provide the features discussed above.

Miyashita is directed to a hot press used, for example, for producing a thin printed board and a multilayered board, such as liquid crystal glass board bonded by a low-viscosity adhesive, and to a hot press suitable for forming a board requiring uniform bonding pressure (Miyashita, Abstract).

Coluzzi is directed to a plant for manufacturing a mold in the form of a multiple-impression plastic plate for reproducing intaglio printing plates (Coluzzi, Abstract).

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for the rejections of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on the teachings of Miyashita and Coluzzi.

Assuming *arguendo* that the teachings of Miyashita could be combined with the teachings of Coluzzi, the combination of Miyashita and Coluzzi would fail to disclose or suggest every feature recited in claim 1. Specifically, the combination of Miyashita and Coluzzi would fail to disclose or suggest, at least, “the second mold comprising a substrate, a heat insulating member disposed on a side of the substrate which side faces the first mold, and a machining member disposed on a side of the heat insulating member which side faces the first mold and comprising irregularities on a surface facing the first mold” and “a heating processing section configured to heat the to-be-machined member to a molding temperature higher than a state change point of a material which constitutes the to-be-machined member” as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

The Office Action cited lower bolster 6 to allege that Miyashita discloses the second mold recited in claim 1. The Office Action further alleged that “the mold includes the substrate (40) and heat insulating member (10a, 10b) which is disposed on a side of the substrate (40) which side faces the first mold (7)” (See Office Action on page 3, paragraph 6). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office’s conclusions.

Rather, Miyashita discloses a lower bolster 6 including a lower heat plate 11a mounted on an upper surface through a heat insulating plate 10a surrounded by a lower frame plate 9a. Miyashita further discloses an upper bolster 7 including an upper heat plate 11b mounted on a lower surface of upper bolster 7 through a heat insulating plate 10b surrounded by an upper frame plate 9b (See Figures 1 and 4; col. 4, lines 32-39).

Miyashita further discloses substrate (board) blanks 40 are inserted between the plate-like vessels 38a and 38b, provided respectively on the lower and upper heat plates 11a and 11b, and are positioned on the upper surface of the lower heat plate 11a in a stacked or superposed manner (Miyashita, col. 5, line 66, to col. 6, line 3).

Therefore, contrary to the Office's assertions, Miyashita fails to disclose or suggest, "the second mold comprising a substrate" as recited in claim 1. Rather, the substrate is a separate element from the second mold (lower bolster 6).

Furthermore, Miyashita fails disclose or suggest, at least, "the second mold comprising...a heat insulating member disposed on a side of the substrate which side faces the first mold" as recited in claim 1.

Rather, Miyashita discloses that lower bolster 6 includes heat insulating plate 10a, which is located on a side of substrate blanks 40 *facing the second mold* (lower bolster 6), not the first mold (upper bolster 7) (See Figures 1, 4-6, and 9; col. 4, lines 32-52). Heat insulating plate 10b is mounted to the upper bolster 7; therefore, the lower bolster 6 does not "comprise" heat insulating plate 10b.

Coluzzi fails to cure the deficiencies of Miyashita with respect to these aforementioned features.

Furthermore, as noted in the Office Action on page 4, Miyashita fails to disclose or suggest, at least, “the second mold comprising... a machining member disposed on a side of the heat insulating member which side faces the first mold and comprising irregularities on a surface facing the first mold” as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, the combination of Miyashita and Coluzzi would fail to disclose or suggest, at least, “a heating processing section configured to heat the to-be-machined member to a molding temperature higher than a state change point of a material which constitutes the to-be-machined member” as recited in claim 1. Neither the teachings of Miyashita nor the teachings of Coluzzi disclose or suggest the aforementioned features for the heating processing section.

Accordingly, the combination of Miyashita and Coluzzi would fail to disclose or suggest every feature recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for the rejections of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on the teachings of Miyashita and Coluzzi.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2-5 should be allowable for at least their dependency upon an allowable base claim, and for the specific limitations recited therein.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and respectfully submits that claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom, are now in condition for allowance.

### **CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Miyashita and Coluzzi would fail to disclose or suggest every feature recited in claims 1-5. The distinctions previously noted are more than sufficient to render the claimed invention non-obvious. It is therefore respectfully requested that all of claims 1-5 be allowed, and this present application be passed to issuance.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, Applicant's undersigned representative at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Brad Y. Chin  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 52,738

**Customer No. 32294**  
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP  
14<sup>TH</sup> Floor  
8000 Towers Crescent Drive  
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-6212  
Telephone: 703-720-7800  
Fax: 703-720-7802

BYC:dlh

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time  
Check No. 018808